



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MEDTRONIC, INC.
710 MEDTRONIC PARKWAY NE
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55432-9924

COPY MAILED

DEC 09 2008

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :
Zhao D. Yong, et al. :
Application No. 10/668,789 :
Filed: September 23, 2003 :
Attorney Docket No. P0010040.00 :
ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition under the unintentional provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed August 21, 2008, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

The application became abandoned for failure to timely file a reply within the meaning of 37 CFR 1.113 to the final Office action of January 30, 2008. The proposed reply required for consideration of a petition to revive must be a Notice of Appeal (and appeal fee required by 37 CFR 41.20(b)(2), an amendment that *prima facie* places the application in condition for allowance, a Request for Continued Examination and submission (37 CFR 1.114), or the filing of a continuing application under 37 CFR 1.53(b). See MPEP 711.03(c)(III)(A)(2). No extensions of time pursuant to the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) were obtained. Accordingly, the date of abandonment of this application is May 1, 2008.

The petition satisfies the requirements of 37 CFR 1.137(b) in that petitioner has supplied (1) the reply in the form of a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and fee of \$810, and the submission required by 37 CFR 1.114; (2) the petition fee of \$1,540; and (3) a proper statement of unintentional delay.

It is not apparent whether the person signing the statement of unintentional delay was in a position to have firsthand or direct knowledge of the facts and circumstances of the delay at issue. Nevertheless, such statement is being treated as having been made as the result of a reasonable inquiry into the facts and circumstances of such delay. See 37 CFR 10.18(b) and Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. 53131, 53178 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 63, 103 (October 21, 1997). In the event that such an inquiry has not been made, petitioner must make such an inquiry. If such inquiry results in the discovery that it is not correct that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due

date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional, petitioner must notify the Office.

There is no indication that the person signing the petition was ever given a power of attorney to prosecute the application. If the person signing the petition desires to receive future correspondence regarding this application, the appropriate power of attorney document must be submitted. While a courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the person signing the petition, all future correspondence will be directed to the address currently of record until appropriate instructions are received.

An extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 must be filed prior to the expiration of the maximum extendable period for reply. See *In re Application of S.*, 8 USPQ2d 1630, 1631 (Comm'r Pats. 1988). Since the \$1,050 extension of time fee submitted with the petition on August 21, 2008 was subsequent to the maximum extendable period for reply, this fee is unnecessary and will be credited to petitioner's deposit account.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to Terri Williams at (571) 272-2991.

This application is being referred to Technology Center AU 3762 for processing of the RCE and for appropriate action by the Examiner in the normal course of business on the amendment submitted in accordance with 37 CFR 1.114.



Chris Bottorff
Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions

cc: **William D. Bauer**
IPLM Group, P.A.
P.O. Box 18455
Minneapolis, MN 55418